

Date: Thu, 7 Apr 94 04:30:02 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #164
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 7 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 164

Today's Topics:

 CB interference and FCC...need help (3 msgs)
 Question about ID'ing... (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 6 Apr 94 16:32:35 GMT
From: hp-cv!hp-pcd!hpcvsnz!tomb@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: CB interference and FCC...need help
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Douglas Dever (ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu) wrote:

: So Mr. 00 goes to his phone and does whatever it is 00's do, and
: eventually word gets to the FCC. Does anything happen?
: Probably not. This is a federal agency! You know, they're part of
: the people who steal money out of your paycheck every month and give
: you nothing in return.

Just last night there was an article about the local FCC monitoring
station in Ferndale, WA. They are getting in trouble for being _too_
zealous in enforcing the rules. They hand out multi-thousand dollar
fines to folk who apparently make occasional honest (?) mistakes.
Senators get called and their aids spend considerable time trying to
get fines reduced.

Ya just can't win.

Date: 6 Apr 94 17:06:56 GMT
From: hp-cv!hp-pcd!hpcvsnz!tomb@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: CB interference and FCC...need help
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I just posted:

: Just last night there was an article about the local FCC monitoring
: station in Ferndale, WA. They are getting in trouble for being _too_

Sorry, I intended to mention the source: front page, Seattle Times
(afternoon newspaper), 05APR94.

Date: 7 Apr 1994 02:17:08 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
cleveland.Freenet.Edu!ak842@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CB interference and FCC...need help
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, tomb@lsid.hp.com (Tom Bruhns) says:

>
>Just last night there was an article about the local FCC monitoring
>station in Ferndale, WA. They are getting in trouble for being _too_
>zealous in enforcing the rules. They hand out multi-thousand dollar
>fines to folk who apparently make occasional honest (?) mistakes.
>Senators get called and their aids spend considerable time trying to
>get fines reduced.
>
>Ya just can't win.
>
>
Welcome to the 90's. :|

--
__ Douglas A. Dever __ ak842@po.cwru.edu
QS0 on 146.82/R anytime! s9000159@llohio.ll.pbs.org
73 de N8VUR

Date: 6 Apr 1994 19:28:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!

netnews.upenn.edu!msuinfo!cravitma@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Question about ID'ing...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

On Tue, 5 Apr 1994 21:54:53 GMT, strange alien beings caused Gary Morris @ignite (garym@alsys.com) to write:

> A lot of dual band radios on the market today have cross band repeat
> capability but totally ignore the ID requirements. I've been trying to
> figure out a way to add an ID'er to my TM-742 for cross band repeat but
> there doesn't seem to be a way. I have to ID it manually on both bands.
> --GaryM

There is a gizmo on the market by a company called Spectrum Concepts for around \$300 that allows you to make your dualbander HT into a full repeater, with hangtime and timeout timers, ID etc. It was reviewed in the March QST.

/Matthew

--

Matthew Cravit, N9VWG | All opinions expressed here are
Michigan State University | my own. I don't speak for MSU
E-Mail: cravitma@cps.msu.ed | and they don't speak for me.
G0/CS -d+@ -p+ c++ !l u+(++) e+(*) s/+ n+(---) h+ f+ !g w+(+++) t++@ r(+) y?

Date: 7 Apr 94 03:55:15 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Question about ID'ing...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Muenzler, Kevin <MUENZLERK@uthscsa.EDU> writes:

>or CW, not to exceed 20 WPM. ATV (450MHz and above) may ID within the
>picture
>that they are sending. SSTV is still required to ID via CW or voice.

ATV can ID within the picture IF the NTSC system (as defined by the FCC's broadcast rules) is being used, such that the picture can be received on a normal TV set fed by a converter. If you're running something really odd -- such as FM video, HDTV or any other incompatible system -- you have to revert to a voice or CW ID so that a monitoring station can receive your ID without the sort of unusual gear you're using.

(Speaking of HDTV, many people in the broadcast industry are calling it "ATV"

now, for "advanced television." In fact that's what the FCC always calls it.
Guess we'll have to find another set of initials...)

Date: 7 Apr 94 03:48:16 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <765221426snx@skyld.grendel.com>, <Cnno4p.Fyr@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<2nrt2g\$67r@abyss.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: 40 meter Broadcast QRM

Dana Myers <myers@spot.West.Sun.COM> writes:

>I wonder which countries the (very impressive) VOA site in Delano, CA
>that I drove past yesterday transmits to?

Probably to their relay sites in the Pacific Rim countries. VOA broadcasts to
Latin America from Bethany, Ohio and Greeneville, North Carolina, but for the
most part they use overseas relay sites to serve other parts of the world. The
relays are fed both by satellite and by HF ISB transmissions from Delano and
Greeneville.

Date: 6 Apr 94 17:12:05 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!ncar!
elmore@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Z0+MJPz.darrylb@delphi.com>, <1994Apr5.130128.184@arrl.org>,
<2ntkaq\$9eo@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>
Subject : Re: CB interference and FCC...need help

In article <2ntkaq\$9eo@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu> ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas
Dever) writes:

... Story of RFI from CB omitted ...

> Ha ha ha ha.... I'm actually quite amused by this. (The ARRL
>tends to amuse me anyways.) It's unfortunate, Ed, that local volunteers
>are powerless to do anything also! Let's face up to something. The
>OO's and Amateur Aux. are POWERLESS! The FCC isn't going to do anything
>about interference, and I doubt my local OO is going to march up and
>knock on some bozo's door and demand his rig at gunpoint.
>

>So I guess that leads us to a question, Ed:
> How exactly is this volunteer going to help out?
>
>"Yup, he's interfering with that there telephone alright. I'll the
>FCC, wish there was something I could do."
>
>So Mr. 00 goes to his phone and does whatever it is 00's do, and
>eventually word gets to the FCC. Does anything happen?
>Probably not. This is a federal agency! You know, they're part of
>the people who steal money out of your paycheck every month and give
>you nothing in return.
>
>It unfortunate that these events happen, but it's a reality we have to
>face until the FCC does somethig about it.

Doug, your ignorance and prejudice is showing. Besides, this
is one of my hot buttons.

I'm the Technical Coordinator for Colorado and before that I
was what is now called a Technical Specialist. The TC and whatever
TSs that can be gathered up chase after amateur-to-consumer
electronics RFI problems. Official Observers (00s) chase down
amateur-to-amateur interference problems and note blatant Part 97
violations from amateurs; they also issue "good guy" reports
occasionally to hams that show exemplary behavior.

Now, to brass tacks. I work quite regularly with the FCC
Denver Field Operations Bureau (FOB) concerning all sorts of problems.
The first case I chased as a TS I was accompanied by Leo Cirbo, an
FCC Engineer, now the Chief Engineer at Denver. He was *very*
interested in the RFI problem, for various reasons. We found that the
ham had some harmonics that were barely above the limit, but that the
problem was with the consumer electronics. The ham had to fix his
problem and we demonstrated to the home-owner that the problems could
be cured with proper filtering applications.

The Denver FOB issued a letter stating that the amateur
station now met all regulatory requirements and that the home
electronics equipment was at fault. They care.

I've worked lots of cases since then with various FCC
engineers. They *ALL* care. And I'll tell you this: they work their
butts off. There are THREE engineers at the Denver FOB and these guys
have to cover New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and half of Nebraska and
South Dakota. And we wonder why they don't leap into their cars and
rush out to render assistance to some ham who gets into a telephone,
or has power line interference problems. Any idea how many calls they
get each day concerning interference problems? I spent what turned

out to be a typical day there and I know: about 50 (I asked if this was typical). And guess what? Most concern interference on business frequencies, problems with BC intermod, public service intermod bugs, problems with telephone service, CATV troubles, interference to aircraft radio navigation and communications and, oh yes, amateur and CB problems as well. Three guys. Day in, day out. Oh yeah, they have to do station inspections at BC sites. And then there are the enforcement actions (they really do go after "freebanders"). And then there's the paperwork.

In the years I've done this I've learned that amateur RFI problems aren't primarily technical: they are diplomatic. The technical problems are **trivial** compared to the interpersonal problems! In almost every case, by the time I'm called the technical problems pale in comparison to the turf war that's broken out. My job, and my TSs job, deals primarily with getting both parties to essentially have a stake in solving the problem. Until they do, the problems will never go away.

When we go on a case, we write up a report to the FCC and all affected parties. The FCC stands behind our findings. If we say the ham has a problem, then we help solve it. When the ham thinks it's fixed, we're expected to go make sure and report on it. When we find the problem lies in the consumer electronics gear, the FCC stands firm: they tell the complainant that the problem will continue until the demonstrated filter applications are made (we aren't finished until we show the complainant what is needed to solve the problem). We've had complainants write Senators and Representatives complaining that **they** shouldn't have to do anything. The FCC sites our work and stands firm when the Congresscritter's office calls the FOB (and they do).

And, if you ever wanted to be treated like a Nobel laureate, just solve an RFI problem in the field some time. The complainant will believe you walk on water. And the PR benefits to ham radio are immeasurable.

The FCC welcomes our participation. They have offered us use of their equipment (spectrum analyzers, field strength meters, heck they'll even send out an enforcement vehicle if we think we need it). The FCC isn't interested in placing blame: they are interested in **compliance**. Would they like to see PL 95-259 (the law giving the FCC power to enforce RFI acceptance specs on consumer electronics) exercised? The guys in Denver sure do. But then, what standards should be set? I participated in some TV RFI and telephone RFI tests with the FCC a couple of years ago so they could get an idea of what's out there. The Denver guys fervently hoped that it would pave the way to RF tolerance criteria for consumer electronics, but Washington

